

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **1.) Claim Amendments**

Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-8, 10, 12-12 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

### **2.) Examiner Objections – Drawings**

The Drawings were objected to because the informal drawings filed on June 18, 2008 with the PCT ISR publication were not of sufficient quality to permit examination. The Applicant hereby re-submits the drawings as filed with the original application on March 31, 2006. These drawings are shown in the EFS "PAIR" system as filed on March 31, 2006 and are labeled as "documents submitted with 371 applications". The Examiner's approval of the drawings is respectfully requested.

### **3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**

Claims 1-2, 6-8, 10 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris, *et al.* (US 2006/0223568) in view of Fournier, *et al.* (US 7,444,160).

As discussed during the Examiner's Interview held on July 17, 2009, the Applicant respectfully submits that newly cited reference Fournier likewise fails to disclose or teach the claimed "push-to-talk server" which first determines that the received push-to-talk session invitation from the calling party includes the "manual answer mode request" and forwards the session invitation to the called party in the requested manual answer mode regardless of any auto-answer mode set by the called party. In that regard, as discussed during the Examiner's Interview, it is the called party in Fournier that requests all incoming calls to be answered in the manual mode and there is nothing in Fournier that discloses or teaches the step of a calling party sending a push-to-talk session invitation with a request for that session invitation to be answered in the manual mode by the called party. Furthermore, there is nothing in Fournier that discloses or teaches the step of a push-to-talk server determining that the manual

answer mode request is included in that session invitation as originated by the calling party.

Accordingly, since Fournier is talking about the opposite side of the session link from the present invention wherein it is the called party who requests all incoming calls to be handled with the manual answer mode, the Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 10 and 12 and their dependent claims are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 3-5 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris, *et al.* (US 2006/0223568) in view of Fournier, *et al.* (US 7,444,160) and further in view of Black (US 2004/0057449). Claims 3-5 and 15 depend on now allowable independent Claims 1 and 12, respectively and recite additional limitations thereto. A Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is therefore earnestly requested.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/John C. Han, Reg#41403/

John C. Han  
Registration No. 41,403

Date: July 24, 2009

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-7686  
john.han@ericsson.com